

***Remarks***

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 5 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. These changes are believed to be fully supported by the specification and are not believed to introduce new matter. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the amendments and additions be entered by the Examiner. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

***Allowable claims 9-20***

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 9-20.

***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,674,270 to Sakamoto (hereinafter "Sakamoto") in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,522,111 to Zadeh *et al.* (hereinafter "Zadeh").

On page 2, the Office Action indicates that the claims do not include the features of a two stage cascoded arrangement, which was argued in the reply filed on June 6, 2005. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 to include this feature.

Claims 1 and 5, as amended, recite a cascoded arrangement of a high voltage regulator and a plurality of low voltage regulators. The Office Action refers to element 1 ("main power") in FIG. 1 of Sakamoto as allegedly being a high voltage regulator, as recited in the claims. However, "main power," as described at, e.g., col. 4, lines 47-58 of

Sakamoto is nothing more than a power supply or line voltage, such as available from a wall outlet. It is not a high voltage regulator. Furthermore, Sakamoto does not describe a two-stage, or cascaded, arrangement as recited in claim 1. Sakamoto only describes a single stage arrangement. Further, the claims 1 and 5 also recite that the high voltage regulator provides an intermediate voltage, *wherein the intermediate voltage is no higher than a breakdown voltage of the low voltage regulators*. (See , claims 1 and 5) Zadeh does not cure the defects of Sakamoto, nor does the Office Action allege this.

Accordingly, the combination of Sakamoto and Zadeh does not teach each and every feature independent claims 1 and 5, and therefore does meet the requirements for prima facie obviousness. (See, MPEP 2142)

Each the above distinctions were discussed in the prior Reply, filed June 6, 2005. However, curiously, none of these arguments were addressed in the present Office Action, dated September 2, 2005. If the rejection is maintained using the cited art mentioned above, Applicants would request that each of the distinctions and arguments recited above be addressed with specificity. Specifically, the cited art does not teach a cascaded arrangement of a high voltage regulator, and a plurality of low voltage regulators, *wherein an intermediate voltage is no higher than a breakdown voltage of the low voltage regulators*.

Based on the above discussion, Applicants request that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be removed, and that these claims be passed to allowance. Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 5, and therefore are patentable for being dependent from an allowable base claim in addition their own patentable features. Accordingly, Applicants request that claims 1-20 be passed to allowance.


***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey  
Agent for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 11/21/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600  
JTH/agj  
SKGF\DCI\205417.1